8 Electron 4.30.03 CMoore

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTY.'S DOCKET: SATO=22

REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Honorable Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Replying to the restriction requirement Office

Action mailed February 26, 2003, applicants hereby

respectfully and provisionally elect Group I, presently claims

1, 2, 5, and 7-9, directed to the products, without prejudice

and without traverse.

Applicants accept that the inventions are patentably distinct from one another, i.e. each is *prima facie* nonobvious from the other.

Applicants hereby authorize the examiner to delete the non-elected method claims 3 and 4 by examiner's amendment upon allowance of the elected subject matter. Applicants rely on their rights, including those under \$\$121, 120 and 119, to

RECEIVED

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

In re of Appln. No. 09/936,289 whatsoever.

proceed with a divisional application without any penalty

Applicants respectfully await the results of a first examination on the merits of the elected subject matter.

Applicants have claimed priority from their corresponding application filed in Japan on March 12, 1999, and, consistent with standard practice under PCT, the International Bureau should have sent a copy of the priority document to the PTO. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the PTO to acknowledge receipt of applicants' papers filed under \$119.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. Attorneys for Applicants

Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

SN: jaa

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528 G:\BN\T\TOYO\SATO22\PTO\Restrict reply.doc